



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

like those of which Martinus Scriblerus justly complains, "when paper has become so cheap, and printers so numerous, a deluge of authors covers the land; whereby not only the peace of the honest unwriting subject is daily molested, but unmerciful demands are made of his applause, yea, of his money, by such as would neither earn the one nor deserve the other."

10.—*Life of Archbishop Laud.* By JOHN N. NORTON, Rector of Ascension Church, Frankfort, Ky., Author of "Full Proof of the Ministry," "Short Sermons," "Life of Bishop Chase," &c. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co., Church Publishers. 1864.

THE commendable feature of this work is that few of the main facts in the life of the Archbishop are omitted or misstated: In the complexion given them, Mr. Norton differs from the most approved historians, and in his attempt at the same time to censure the acts and praise the actor, to prove the Primate at once influential and irresponsible, he falls into numerous inconsistencies.

It does not consist with our present limits to discuss the character of Laud. History shows that he heartily agreed in plan and purpose with Charles and Strafford. This Mr. Norton is eager to demonstrate. History shows also that the design of this triumvirate was the overthrow of English liberty, and the establishment of an absolute monarchy. This design Mr. Norton either doubts or approves, since he admires its authors. Though it would be unfair to charge upon the author any distinct expression of opinion, his sympathies are evidently on the side of arbitrary power. The misfortune of his birth has brought him into the world some centuries too late. His epithets often savor of justice and freedom, yet he speaks of Laud and Strafford as "noble spirits," a "noble-hearted pair," and he relates the attempt of Charles to seize the five members with no word of comment other than this: "How sorely he must have missed Strafford! The *great Earl* would have *dragged* them from any hiding-place, but Charles alone was no match for a Puritan Parliament."

With the sentiments thus indicated are united an intolerant zeal for the Church of England, and a rancorous hatred of everything "Puritan," so that one who sympathizes at the present day with the principles of the Puritans can hardly read the book without a little retrospective tingling of the ears.

We are spared, however, one source of pain, often existing in works of this character, that of finding a bad cause supported with great ability. If the author's principles are narrow, his argument in their

support is not powerful, and his research is not extensive. He deems the Edinburgh riot "*the greatest exhibition of profanity and wickedness perpetrated, under the name of religion, by any so-called religious party.*" "English people," he tells us, "so little understood toleration, that they drove James II. from his throne for his endeavors to bring it about."

The number of peers who were present when the ordinance of execution was passed is stated at *six*, differing not only from the best, but we believe from all authorities.

The style is worthy of the subject. Emphasis is left chiefly with the printer, who is forced to supply by italics and capitals the complete want of inherent vigor. Scripture phrases are frequently introduced in a way which diminishes the force of their grand words, without communicating energy to a vapid train of remark. Cheap, unauthorized, inelegant colloquialisms abound. "Somehow or other," "stormed a good deal," "went wrong," "mixed up," "sad pity," "managed to get along," "raking up," and similar phrases, deface the most serious parts of the narrative.

Often one is puzzled to know whether the diction or the sentiment is more ridiculous. Laud was born in a kingdom "where princes and nobles *of high degree* overshadow *those* of humble birth." "The birth of the clothier's son was little heeded by the busy world!" "The child was so extremely weak and sickly, that few thought he could long survive. . . . While it is *by no means certain* that a person will attain eminence in after life, *merely because he is small in infancy*, it has happened curiously enough," &c., — and the case of Laud is sustained by the diminutive size and "perishable shape" of the infant Newton. After the marriage of the Earl of Devonshire, Laud's "own wretchedness from the upbraidings of conscience was very great, and his enemies made use of it to prevent him from rising," &c. We soon find, however, that "his rise was *gradual, though slow, gaining a stall,*" &c. He is permitted to recover from a fit, being "spared for *sorer trials, yet to come*"! At the coronation of Charles I., after various preliminaries, "Then he swore to confirm to the people of England the laws and customs *granted* by his predecessors; and *they* [evidently the "predecessors," though one is at a loss to see how they could have accomplished the act] placed the crown of St. Edward on his head, and the people shouted," &c. When, after such instances, we read that a "great conflict had *began,*" or that "it was to his kind offices that the acute and active powers of this remarkable man were turned into the proper channel," we scarcely know whether to suspect author or printer. But when we learn that Williams survived his controversy with Laud

“to enjoy the luxury of *retribution*,” that “another *arbitrary act charged upon Laud* was his attempt to force upon the foreign Protestants,” &c., and find an important chapter rounded off with a reference to “the *majestic ears* of the Long Parliament,” we cannot doubt to whom the credit of such rhetoric belongs.

May all apologies for such characters as Laud be so written!

11. — *Report of the Engineer and Artillery Operations of the Army of the Potomac, from its Organization to the Close of the Peninsular Campaign.* By Brig.-Gen. J. G. BARNARD, Chief Engineer, and Brig.-Gen. W. F. BARRY, Chief of Artillery. Illustrated by eighteen Maps, Plans, etc. New York: D. Van Nostrand. 1863.

NEXT to General McClellan's Report, this book is the most valuable to students of the history of the army of the Potomac of all that have as yet been published. It begins with General Barnard's Report, addressed to General McClellan's Chief of Staff, and dated January 26, 1863. This Report opens with an interesting, though very brief, statement of the theory of the series of works which constitute the defences of Washington, and a description, equally brief, of the times and manner of their commencement and completion. This is followed by a statement of the way in which the engineer forces attached to the army of the Potomac were constituted during its campaign on the Peninsula. Next comes an admirable description of the Chickahominy, considered as a military obstacle, from which the reader may form an accurate idea of the river, the swamp and bottom-land which border it, and the neighboring highlands. The rest of this Report consists mainly of an account of the part taken by the Engineer forces in the advance on Richmond, in the movements executed by the army in the “Seven Days,” in the construction of a defensive line at Harrison's Landing, and in the withdrawal of the army from the Peninsula. The engineering operations at the siege of Yorktown are described in another Report of General Barnard, printed later in the volume, p. 136. General Barnard's reports, and the sub-reports made to him, contain abundant and valuable information upon the subjects of the building and making of military bridges and roads.

Next comes Colonel Alexander's Report of the operations upon which he was engaged between April 20th and May 12th, 1862. This Report is clear, interesting, and altogether a most agreeable specimen of military writing. It gives a full and minute description of the plans devised and successfully followed by Colonel Alexander, for landing troops and constructing temporary wharves. It is likely to be a most